



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/549,591	05/22/2006	Kunio Fukuda	SONYJP 3.3-364	1103
530 7590 02/04/2008 LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG, KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK 600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST WESTFIELD, NJ 07090			EXAMINER RIVERO, ALEJANDRO	
			ART UNIT 2618	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/04/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/549,591

Applicant(s)

FUKUDA, KUNIO

Examiner

Alejandro Rivero

Art Unit

2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 September 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. Figures 1, 2 and 3 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The drawings are objected to because: the power amplifier in figure 5 should be labeled "65" instead of "67" (see second full paragraph of page 22 of the written description). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date

of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure. The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details. The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds 150 words and because it contains the phrases "The invention relates to" (first sentence) and "The invention applies" (last sentence), which can be implied. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

4. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The following title is

respectfully suggested by the examiner: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR POWER CONTROL IN WIRELESS LAN TRANSMISSIONS.

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

In page 6 (lines 16-17), the examiner respectfully suggests replacing "the base station 2" with "the terminal 2".

In page 41 (line 15), the examiner respectfully suggests replacing "unit" with "until".

In page 44 (line 2) the examiner respectfully suggests replacing "full-posser" with "full-power".

In page 44 (line 20) the examiner respectfully suggests replacing "terminal 3" with "terminal 2".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 7 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims to computer data structures and programs per se are not statutory subject matter and are ineligible for patenting. See MPEP 2106 IV B 1(a). On the other hand, a claim to a tangible computer-readable medium encoded with a computer data structure or program is eligible statutory subject matter, i.e. it is one of the four categories of enumerated subject matter, because it is a

computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other components of a computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized. The examiner respectfully suggests modifying the claim to clearly indicate it is an article of manufacture claim, that the contents are carried on a computer readable or useable medium in a manner that will affect the operation of the computer, what the result using the article of manufacture is, and each of the patentably significant elements of the program or data structure that imparts the patentable functionality, so long as it is supported by the specification, in order to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101. For the purpose of this examination, claims 7 and 16 will be treated as being directed to "A program stored in a recording medium" instead of "A program".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Whitehead (US 5,732,077).

Consider claim 1, Whitehead discloses an information processing apparatus for communicating wirelessly with administrative system (base station) and for transmitting data to a second information processing apparatus via said administrative system

(column 3 line 66- column 4 line 60), said information processing apparatus comprising communicating means for transmitting data to said administrative system and for transmitting or receiving information for controlling the wireless communication with said administrative system (column 3 line 66- column 4 line 60, column 9 line 49- column 10 line 3, figure 5, where Whitehead discloses transmitting and receiving control information and an interface module for transmitting and receiving between stations wherein one of the hosts can be a base station); measuring means for measuring a reception level of said information or of said data being received by said communicating means (column 2 line 49- column 3 line 30, column 5 lines 53-64); and controlling means for controlling transmission power in a manner allowing said communicating means to transmit said information or said data (column 3 lines 7-30); wherein said controlling means controls said transmission power in such a manner that a first item of said information signaling a start of transmission of said data is transmitted at a maximum controllable transmission power level or at a first transmission power level close to said maximum controllable transmission power level (column 5 line 37- column 6 line 65, column 9 line 49- column 10 line 3, figure 5, where Whitehead discloses each station transmits REQUEST and PERMIT messages at or below the maximum allowed power and at no more than the maximum power allowed, respectively); and wherein, if a second item of said information is transmitted by said administrative system based on the first information item to enable the start of transmission of said data and is received by said communicating means, then said measuring means measures a reception level of the second information item and said controlling means controls the power for

transmitting said data based on said reception level measured by said measuring means (column 2 line 49- column 3 line 30, column 3 line 66- column 4 line 60, column 5 line 37- column 6 line 65, column 9 line 49- column 10 line 3, figure 5, where Whitehead discloses a PERMIT message (enable start of transmission), measuring RSSI of each (hence second information item) packet).

Consider claim 5, Whitehead discloses an information processing method for use with an information processing apparatus for communicating wirelessly with administrative system (base station) and for transmitting data to a second information processing apparatus via said administrative system (column 3 line 66- column 4 line 60), said information processing method comprising the steps of firstly controlling transmission power in such a manner that first information signaling a start of transmission of said data is transmitted at a maximum controllable transmission power level or at a first transmission power level close to said maximum controllable transmission power level (column 5 line 37- column 6 line 65, column 9 line 49- column 10 line 3, figure 5, where Whitehead discloses each station transmits REQUEST and PERMIT messages at or below the maximum allowed power and at no more than the maximum power allowed, respectively); controlling reception of second information transmitted by said administrative system based on said first information, said second information enabling the start of transmission of said data (column 2 line 49- column 3 line 30, column 3 line 66- column 4 line 60, column 5 line 37- column 6 line 65, column 9 line 49- column 10 line 3, figure 5, where Whitehead discloses receiving a PERMIT message enabling start of transmission), measuring a reception level of said second

information and secondly controlling transmission power in such a manner that said data is transmitted at a transmission power level based on said reception level of said second information measured in said measuring step (column 2 line 49- column 3 line 30, column 3 line 66- column 4 line 60, column 5 line 37- column 6 line 65, column 9 line 49- column 10 line 3, figure 5, where Whitehead discloses a PERMIT message (enable start of transmission), measuring RSSI of each (hence second information item) packet).

Consider claim 6, Whitehead discloses a recording medium which stores a program in a manner readable by a computer (column 9 line 49- column 10 line 3, figure 5, where Whitehead discloses a CPU with instructions for performing the method), said program causing said computer to execute a process allowing an information processing apparatus to communicate wirelessly with administrative system (base station) and to transmit data to a second information processing apparatus via said administrative system (column 3 line 66- column 4 line 60), said program comprising the steps of firstly controlling transmission power in such a manner that first information signaling a start of transmission of said data is transmitted at a maximum controllable transmission power level or at a first transmission power level close to said maximum controllable transmission power level (column 5 line 37- column 6 line 65, column 9 line 49- column 10 line 3, figure 5, where Whitehead discloses each station transmits REQUEST and PERMIT messages at or below the maximum allowed power and at no more than the maximum power allowed, respectively); controlling reception of second information transmitted by said administrative system based on said first information,

said second information enabling the start of transmission of said data (column 2 line 49- column 3 line 30, column 3 line 66- column 4 line 60, column 5 line 37- column 6 line 65, column 9 line 49- column 10 line 3, figure 5, where Whitehead discloses receiving a PERMIT message enabling start of transmission), measuring a reception level of said second information and secondly controlling transmission power in such a manner that said data is transmitted at a transmission power level based on said reception level of said second information measured in said measuring step (column 2 line 49- column 3 line 30, column 3 line 66- column 4 line 60, column 5 line 37- column 6 line 65, column 9 line 49- column 10 line 3, figure 5, where Whitehead discloses a PERMIT message (enable start of transmission), measuring RSSI of each (hence second information item) packet).

Consider claim 7 (and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 above), Whitehead discloses all the limitations as applied to claim 6 above which read on all the limitations of claim 7.

Consider claim 8, Whitehead discloses an information processing apparatus for transmitting data to a second information processing apparatus via administrative system (base station) which, upon receipt of first information (REQUEST) requesting permission of a start of data transmission, transmits second information (PERMIT) enabling the start of the data transmission (column 3 line 66- column 4 line 60, column 5 line 37- column 6 line 65, column 9 line 49- column 10 line 3, figure 5, where Whitehead discloses each station transmits REQUEST and PERMIT messages and an interface module for transmitting and receiving between stations wherein one of the hosts can be

a base station), said information processing apparatus comprising: communicating means which receives information from said administrative system and which, on transmitting said data to said second information processing apparatus, transmits said data to said administrative system after transmission of said second information (column 2 line 49- column 3 line 30, column 3 line 66- column 4 line 60, column 5 line 37- column 6 line 65, column 9 line 49- column 10 line 3, figure 5, where Whitehead discloses a PERMIT message (second information), and transmitting after receiving permission).

Consider claim 9, Whitehead discloses all the limitations as applied to claim 8 above and also discloses wherein said communicating means designates an address of said information processing apparatus as a receiving address in said second information and transmits said second information (column 4 lines 25-45, column 6 lines 12-58).

Consider claim 10, Whitehead discloses all the limitations as applied to claim 8 above and also discloses measuring means for measuring a reception level of said information received by said communicating means from said administrative system or of said data transmitted by said administrative system to said second information processing apparatus (column 2 line 49- column 3 line 30, column 5 lines 53-64); and controlling means for controlling transmission power in a manner allowing said communicating means to transmit said second information and said data (column 3 lines 7-30); wherein said communicating means communicates wirelessly with said administrative system (column 3 line 66- column 4 line 60, column 9 line 49- column 10

line 3, figure 5, where Whitehead discloses transmitting and receiving control information and an interface module for transmitting and receiving between stations wherein one of the hosts can be a base station); and wherein said controlling means controls transmission power in such a manner that said second information is transmitted at a maximum controllable transmission power level or at a first transmission power level close to said maximum controllable transmission power level (column 5 line 37- column 6 line 65, column 9 line 49- column 10 line 3, figure 5, where Whitehead discloses each station transmits REQUEST and PERMIT messages at or below the maximum allowed power and at no more than the maximum power allowed, respectively), and that said data is transmitted thereafter at a transmission power level based on said reception level measured by said measuring means (column 2 line 49- column 3 line 30, column 3 line 66- column 4 line 60, column 5 line 37- column 6 line 65, column 9 line 49- column 10 line 3, figure 5, where Whitehead discloses a PERMIT message (enable start of transmission), measuring RSSI of each (hence second information item) packet).

Consider claim 14, Whitehead discloses an information processing method for use with an information processing apparatus for transmitting data to a second information processing apparatus via administrative system (base station) which, upon receipt of first information (REQUEST) requesting permission of a start of data transmission, transmits second information (PERMIT) enabling the start of the data transmission (column 3 line 66- column 4 line 60, column 5 line 37- column 6 line 65, column 9 line 49- column 10 line 3, figure 5, where Whitehead discloses each station

transmits REQUEST and PERMIT messages and an interface module for transmitting and receiving between stations wherein one of the hosts can be a base station), said information processing method comprising the steps of firstly controlling transmission of said second information and secondly controlling transmission of said data to said second information processing apparatus via said administrative system (column 2 line 49- column 3 line 30, column 3 line 66- column 4 line 60, column 5 line 37- column 6 line 65, column 9 line 49- column 10 line 3, figure 5, where Whitehead discloses a PERMIT message (second information), and transmitting after receiving permission).

Consider claim 15, Whitehead discloses a recording medium which stores a program in a manner readable by a computer (column 9 line 49- column 10 line 3, figure 5, where Whitehead discloses a CPU with instructions for performing the method), said program causing said computer to execute a process allowing an information processing apparatus to transmit data to a second information processing apparatus via administrative system (base station) which, upon receipt of first information (REQUEST) requesting permission of a start of data transmission, transmits second information (PERMIT) enabling the start of the data transmission (column 3 line 66- column 4 line 60, column 5 line 37- column 6 line 65, column 9 line 49- column 10 line 3, figure 5, where Whitehead discloses each station transmits REQUEST and PERMIT messages and an interface module for transmitting and receiving between stations wherein one of the hosts can be a base station), said program comprising the steps of: firstly controlling transmission of said second information; and secondly controlling transmission of said data to said second information processing apparatus via said administrative system

(column 2 line 49- column 3 line 30, column 3 line 66- column 4 line 60, column 5 line 37- column 6 line 65, column 9 line 49- column 10 line 3, figure 5, where Whitehead discloses a PERMIT message (second information), and transmitting after receiving permission).

Consider claim 16 (and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 above), Whitehead discloses all the limitations as applied to claim 15 above which read on all the limitations of claim 16.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

11. Claims 2 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitehead in view of Brozovich et al. (US 5,661,434).

Consider claims 2 and 11, Whitehead discloses all the limitations as applied to claims 1 and 10 above and also disclose controlling a signal level for transmitting said

first information item or said data and wherein said controlling means controls said power for transmitting said first information item or said data (column 3 lines 7-30, column 5 line 37- column 6 line 65, column 9 line 49- column 10 line 3, figure 5, where Whitehead discloses transmitting messages at or below the maximum allowed power and at no more than the maximum power allowed, hence controlling a signal level).

Whitehead does not specify a plurality of amplifying means for amplifying said signal level at different amplification factors by selecting any one of said plurality of amplifying means.

Brozovich et al. disclose a plurality of amplifying means (amplifiers) for amplifying said signal level at different amplification factors (levels) by selecting any one of said plurality of amplifying means (column 1 line 63- column 4 line 25).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a plurality of amplifying means for amplifying said signal level at different amplification factors by selecting any one of said plurality of amplifying means as taught by Brozovich et al. in the apparatus of Whitehead in order to operate at various power levels thereby minimizing interference with other transceivers and maintaining a higher transmitting efficiency thus reducing power consumption which is particularly advantageous for battery-powered handheld devices because it prolongs battery service life (as suggested by Brozovich et al. in column 1 lines 12-33, column 1 lines 55-60, column 2 lines 18-22).

12. Claims 3 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitehead in view of Sato (US 5,592,468) and Bark et al. (US 2002/0077138 A1).

Consider claims 3 and 12, Whitehead discloses all the limitations as applied to claims 1 and 10 above and also disclose wherein said controlling means assess a data length of said data to be transmitted (column 6 lines 12-65 where Whitehead discloses transmitting/receiving length information) and exercise control of transmit power level (column 3 lines 7-30, column 5 line 37- column 6 line 65, column 9 line 49- column 10 line 3, figure 5, where Whitehead discloses transmitting messages at or below the maximum allowed power and at no more than the maximum power allowed, hence controlling transmission power level).

Whitehead does not disclose comparing the data length with a threshold value wherein, if said data length is less than said threshold value then said controlling means exercises control in such a manner that said data is transmitted at said first transmission power level; and wherein, if said data length is greater than said threshold value; then said controlling means exercises control in such a manner that said data is transmitted at a second transmission power level lower than said first transmission power level.

Sato discloses comparing the data length with a threshold value, determining if said data length is less than said threshold value and determining if said data length is greater than said threshold value (column 16 lines 14-22, column 20 lines 54-57, column 21 lines 56-59).

Bark et al. disclose wherein data is transmitted at a first transmission power level and data is transmitted at a second transmission power level lower than said first transmission power level, based on data length (paragraphs [0026]-[0027], [0037],

[0052], where Bark et al. disclose adjusting transmission power based on traffic loads, reads on data length).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to transmit at a first transmission power level and to transmit data at a second transmission power level lower than said first transmission power level, based on data length (traffic load), having compared the data length with a threshold value, wherein if said data length is less than the threshold value then transmitting at a first transmission power level and if said data length is greater than the threshold value then transmitting at a second transmission power level lower than said first transmission power level for the purpose of achieving optimal power control (which is advantageous in the use of mobile radios since battery-powered mobile radios have a limited battery life, thus it is important to conserve and extend battery life) without compromising link quality (as suggested by Bark et al. in paragraphs [0005], [0016]-[0020], [0023], [0026]-[0027], [0036]-[0037], [0052], [0068], and as suggested by Sato in column 2 line 43- column 3 line 11, column 15 line 66- column 16 line 22).

13. Claims 4 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitehead in view of Ikegami (US 6,393,032 B1).

Consider claims 4 and 13, Whitehead discloses all the limitations as applied to claims 1 and 8 above and also disclose wherein, and wherein said first information item is an RTS frame and said second information item is a CTS frame (column 2 lines 13-46, column 5 lines 7-53, where Whitehead discloses REQUEST and PERMIT messages, reads on RTS and CTS).

Whitehead does not specify that communication with said administrative system is carried out according to IEEE 802.11 standards.

Ikegami discloses communication with said administrative system is carried out according to IEEE 802.11 standards (column 2 line 27- column 4 line 23).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to communicate using IEEE 802.11 standard as taught by Ikegami in the apparatus of Whitehead because the IEEE 802.11 communication standard allows for high-rate data transfers (as suggested by Ikegami in column 1 lines 6-10, column 2 lines 3-23).

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Whitehead (US 6,295,285 B1) discloses a method for dynamic resource allocation.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alejandro Rivero whose telephone number is 571-272-2839. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on 571-272-7882. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may

Application/Control Number:
10/549,591
Art Unit: 2618

Page 18

be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AR


NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER